

### REMARKS

Claims 1 - 21 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments noted is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to include the limitations that the medical tubing anchor anchors a plurality of medical tubing and that each of the at least one tube holder of each station is capable of receiving separate medical tubing. Support for these limitations can be found in the specification on page 1, lines 6 - 8, page 2, lines 26 - 28, page 9, lines 8 - 11, and page 16, lines 10 - 25, as well as FIG. 8.

In the Office Action, claims 1 - 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, lack of sufficient antecedent basis was found for the term "said tube holders" in claims 1 and 20; these claims recite "at least one tube holder" and then proceed to recite "said tube holders." Therefore, applicant has amended claims 1 and 20 such that "said tube holders" now reads --said at least one tube holder--. Applicant submits that the claims are now definite and respectfully requests that the Section 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1 - 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 1 - 2, 4 - 5, 8 - 13, 17, and 20 - 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 4,397,647). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To begin, Gordon fails to disclose a medical tubing anchor that anchors a plurality of medical tubing. Gordon is only capable of stabilizing one catheter tube at a time (for example, see FIGS. 4 and 7 of Gordon). Further, Gordon fails to disclose that each of the at least one tube holder of each station is capable of receiving separate medical tubing. In Gordon, even if ribs 21, 28 are considered to be tube holders, the ribs 21, 28 all support the same catheter tube that is inserted into the stabilizer.

Furthermore, Gordon fails to disclose an anchor member having a plurality of stations defined by passageways transversing the anchor member and extending from one elongated side to the other elongated side. Even if the two sections of the cradle 16 of Gordon (see FIG. 4 and col. 4, lines 9 and 10) are considered to be stations, these sections are not defined by passageways that transverse the anchor member. Nor are these sections defined by passageways that extends from one elongated side to the other elongated side of the cradle 16. Instead, each section has a passageway that begins at an end of the cradle and terminates at an inner portion of the cradle. In contrast to Gordon, in the present invention each of the plurality of stations extends from one side to the other side of the anchor member, allowing each station to receive and support one or more separate medical tubes.

Moreover, Gordon fails to disclose a tube holder having a generally cylindrical cross-section. If the ribs 21, 28 of Gordon are considered to be tube holders, the ribs 21, 28 are not tube holders having a generally cylindrical cross-section. Instead, the ribs 21, 28 each have a semi-circular cutout portion. No cross-section of the ribs 21, 28 results in a cylindrical shape.

For all of these reasons, applicant submits that claims 1 and 20 are allowable over Gordon. Claims 2, 4 - 5, 8 - 13, 17, and 21, depending directly or indirectly from one of either claim 1 or claim 20, are also allowable. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 - 2, 4 - 5, 8 - 13, 17, and 20 - 21 as being anticipated by Gordon be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Gale (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,226). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments made above with respect to the patentability of claim 1 over Gordon. Based upon those arguments, claim 1 is allowable over Gordon. Claim 6, depending from claim 1, is therefore also allowable over Gordon, and any combination of Gordon with Gale.

Therefore, applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable over Gordon and Gale, and applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 6 as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Gale be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 7, 14 - 16, and 18 - 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Based upon the above, applicant submits that claim 1 is in allowable form. Claims 3, 7, 14 - 16, and 18 - 19, depending directly or indirectly from claim 1, are therefore also in allowable form.

This amendment and request for reconsideration is felt to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary A. Gillis et al.

Fildes & Outland, P.C.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris J. Fildes", written in black ink.

---

Christopher J. Fildes, Attorney  
Registration No. 32,132  
20916 Mack Avenue, Suite 2  
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236  
(313) 885-1500